



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/563,028	12/30/2005	Sang-Ho Shin	HLE-0023	8513
23413 7590 04/21/2008 CANTOR COLBURN, LLP 20 Church Street 22nd Floor Hartford, CT 06103				
EXAMINER				
VO, HAI				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1794				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/21/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/563,028

Applicant(s)

SHIN, SANG-HO

Examiner

Hai Vo

Art Unit

1794

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 January 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 and 13-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 17-19 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 and 13-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

1. All of the art rejections are maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-11 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kurz et al (US 4,071,369) further in view of Leach (US 3,762,935) and Engstrom et al (US 3,942,990) as evidenced by EP 839 778. Kurz teaches a porous ceramic panel prepared from a ceramic composition comprising an expandable clay mineral and silicon carbide in an amount of 0.2 wt% (example 2). The porous ceramic panel has a closed cell structure (column 6, lines 20-25). The ceramic panel has a density of 0.4 to 0.5 g/cc. Kurz does not teach the ceramic composition comprising a glass. Leach, however, teaches a foamed ceramic material comprising glass frits in an amount of 1wt% to 20 wt% (column 3, lines 65-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add glass frits into the ceramic composition motivated by the desire to facilitate the growth of the individual foam cells which remain unconnected, thereby improving the heat insulating properties of the porous ceramic panels.

Kurz does not specifically disclose the SiC pore forming agent present in an amount of 0.5 to 5 wt%. Engstrom, however, teaches the use of SiC as a

pore-forming agent for forming a foamed ceramic that has a closed cell structure (column 3, lines 55-60; column 4, lines 55-60). SiC is present in an amount ranging from 0.1 to 0.5 wt%. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the SiC into the ceramic composition in an amount as taught by Engstrom motivated by the desire to provide the porous ceramic panel with uniform pore distribution with closed pores.

It is known in the art that the expandable clay composition comprising all the ingredients set forth in the claims as evidenced by EP'778.

Kurz as modified by Leach/Engstrom uses the same ceramic composition and the same technique for forming a ceramic panel as Applicant, i.e. firing and foaming the clay composition at a temperature of from 1100°C to 1200°C (example 1). The resulting ceramic panel has a closed cell structure, a density within the claimed range. Therefore, it is not seen that the pore density, pore volume, water permeability, flame retardant property, flexural strength, bending strength, far infrared radiation rate, far infrared radiation energy, thermal conductivity would be inherently present as like material has like property. This is in line with *In re Spada*, 15 USPQ 2d 1655 (1990) which holds that products of identical chemical composition can not have mutually exclusive properties.

4. Claims 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kurz et al (US 4,071,369) in view of Leach (US 3,762,935) and Engstrom et al (US 3,942,990) as evidenced by EP 839 778 as applied to claim 1 above,

further in view of Bergh (US 3,727,838). Kurz does not specifically disclose the ceramic panel having a sandwich structure by attaching steel plated to both top and bottom sides of the ceramic panel. Bergh, however, teaches an insulating railjoint endpost comprising an insulating ceramic material sandwiching between two steel plates via an epoxy adhesive (abstract, claim 1). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have two steel plates bonded to each side of the insulating ceramic material by an epoxy adhesive because such is an intended use of the material and Bergh provides necessary details to practice the invention of Kurz.

5. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kurz et al (US 4,071,369) in view of Leach (US 3,762,935) Engstrom et al (US 3,942,990) as evidenced by EP 839 778 as applied to claim 1 above, further in view of RO 114015. Kurz does not specifically disclose the ceramic panel having a protrusion on one side and a groove on the opposite side. RO'015 discloses a ceramic wall panel having a protrusion on one side and a groove on the opposite side so that two adjacent ceramic panels could be connected together by coupling between the protrusion and the groove. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form a ceramic wall panel having a protrusion on one side and a groove on the opposite side so that two adjacent ceramic panels could be connected together by coupling between the protrusion and the groove.

Response to Arguments

6. The art rejections over Kurz in view of Leach and Engstrom have been maintained for the following reasons. Applicant contends that the combination of Kurz, Leach and Engstrom fails to achieve the claimed invention. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Kurz teaches a porous ceramic panel prepared from a ceramic composition comprising an expandable clay mineral and silicon carbide in an amount of 0.2 wt% (example 2). The porous ceramic panel has a closed cell structure (column 6, lines 20-25). The ceramic panel has a density of 0.4 to 0.5 g/cc. Kurz does not teach the ceramic composition comprising a glass. Leach, however, teaches a foamed ceramic material comprising glass frits in an amount of 1wt% to 20 wt% (column 3, lines 65-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add glass frits into the ceramic composition motivated by the desire to facilitate the growth of the individual foam cells which remain unconnected, thereby improving the heat insulating properties of the porous ceramic panels.

Kurz does not specifically disclose the SiC pore forming agent present in an amount of 0.5 to 5 wt%. Engstrom, however, teaches the use of SiC as a pore-forming agent for forming a foamed ceramic that has a closed cell structure (column 3, lines 55-60; column 4, lines 55-60). The SiC is present in an amount from 0.1 to 0.5 wt%. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the SiC into the ceramic composition in an amount as taught by Engstrom motivated by

the desire to provide the porous ceramic panel with uniform pore distribution with closed pores.

Applicant further asserts that an amount of silicon carbide is critical to the formation of the super lightweight ceramic panel of the present invention. The arguments are not found persuasive for patentability because nothing in table 2 of the present invention has shown that too little silicon carbide added would materially affect the novel or basic characteristics of Applicant's invention. Applicant argues that Engstrom does not teach a composition comprising glass and 0.5 to 5 wt% silicon carbide. Engstrom does not need to teach a composition comprising glass because this issue has been addressed by Leach. Engstrom does teach silicon carbide present in an amount ranging from 0.1 to 0.5 wt% which meets a lower limit of the claimed range. Accordingly, the art rejections are sustained.

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be

calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hai Vo whose telephone number is (571) 272-1485. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday, from 9:00 to 6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rena Dye can be reached on (571) 272-3186. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Art Unit: 1794

/Hai Vo/

Hai Vo

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1794